1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNI	A

LEONARD L. LLAMAS, Plaintiff,

v.

KIMBERLY A SEIBEL,

Defendant.

Case No. 16-cv-05812 NC

ORDER OF SERVICE

Re: Dkt. No. 1

Petitioner Leonard L. Llamas, a state prisoner incarcerated at Chuckawalla Valley State Prison, has filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254.

I. **BACKGROUND**

Petitioner was convicted by a jury of battery with a strike enhancement in the Santa Clara Superior Court of the State of California. In February 2012, he was sentenced to eight years in state prison. Petitioner unsuccessfully appealed his conviction to the California Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court of California, which on September 30, 2015, denied review of a petition allegedly raising the same claims raised here.

II. **DISCUSSION**

Legal Standard

This court may entertain a petition for writ of habeas corpus "in behalf of a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court only on the ground that he is in custody in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States." 28 U.S.C. Case No. 16-cv-05812 NC

24

25

26

27

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

§ 2254(a). It shall "award the writ or issue an order directing the respondent to show cause why the writ should not be granted, unless it appears from the application that the applicant or person detained is not entitled thereto." 28 U.S.C. § 2243. Summary dismissal is appropriate only where the allegations in the petition are vague or conclusory, palpably incredible, or patently frivolous or false. See Hendricks v. Vasquez, 908 F.2d 490, 491 (9th Cir. 1990).

В. **Petitioner's Legal Claims**

Petitioner seeks federal habeas corpus relief by raising the following claims: denial of the right of self representation and ineffective assistance of counsel. Liberally construed, the claims appear colorable under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 and merit an answer from respondent.

III. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons and for good cause shown:

- 1. The clerk shall serve by certified mail a copy of this order and the petition and all attachments thereto upon respondent. The clerk shall also serve a copy of this order on petitioner.
- 2. Respondent shall file with the court and serve on petitioner, within 60 days of the date of this order, an answer showing why a writ of habeas corpus should not be issued (or -an answer conforming in all respects to Rule 5 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, showing cause why a writ of habeas corpus should not be issued). Respondent shall file with the answer and serve on petitioner a copy of all portions of the administrative record that are relevant to a determination of the issues presented by the petition.
- 3. If the petitioner wishes to respond to the answer, he shall do so by filing a traverse with the court and serving it on respondent within 30 days of his receipt of the answer.

4. Respondent shall file a consent or declination to magistrate judge jurisdiction within 14 days.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 21, 2016

NATHANAEL M. COUSINS United States Magistrate Judge

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
LEONARD L. LLAMAS, Plaintiff,	Case No. 16-cv-05812-NC	
v. KIMBERLY A SEIBEL, Defendant.	CONSENT OR DECLINATION TO MAGISTRATE JUDGE JURISDICTION	
INSTRUCTIONS: Please indicate be	low by checking one of the two boxes whether	
you (if you are the party) or the party you represent (if you are an attorney in the case)		
choose(s) to consent or decline magistrate judge jurisdiction in this matter. Sign this form		
below your selection.		
() Consent to Magistrate Judge Jurisdiction		
In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(c), I voluntarily consent to		
have a United States magistrate judge conduct all further proceedings in this case,		
including trial and entry of final judgment. I understand that appeal from the judgment		
shall be taken directly to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.		
OR		
() Decline Magistrate Judge Jurisdiction		
In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(c), I decline to have a United		
States magistrate judge conduct all further proceedings in this case and I hereby request		
that this case be reassigned to a United State	es district judge.	
DATE:	NAME: COUNSEL FOR: (OR "PRO SE:)	
	Signature	